

BINOMIAL CANONICAL DECOMPOSITIONS OF BINOMIAL IDEALS

IGNACIO OJEDA

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we prove that every binomial ideal in a polynomial ring over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero admits a canonical primary decomposition into binomial ideals. Moreover, we prove that this special decomposition is obtained from a cellular decomposition which is also defined in a canonical way and does not depend on the field.

INTRODUCTION

It is well known that in general an ideal of a commutative Noetherian ring does not have a unique minimal primary decomposition; for example, the ideal $\langle x^2, xy \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ has infinitely many minimal primary decompositions: $\langle x^2, xy \rangle = \langle x \rangle \cap \langle x^2, xy, y^m \rangle$, $m \geq 1$. However, it is possible to define a primary decomposition with uniqueness property. This primary decomposition is due to V. Ortiz ([9]) and is called the canonical decomposition (see Theorem 1.2).

On the other hand, if I is a binomial ideal in a polynomial ring S over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{k}$, there exists a primary decomposition of I into binomial ideals, where by binomial ideal we mean an ideal of S generated by polynomials with at most two terms.

However, the primary components in the canonical decomposition of a binomial ideal are not necessarily binomial (see Example 1.5). So, the initial motivation of this work was to answer the following question: is it possible to define a canonical primary decomposition of a binomial ideal in terms of binomial ideals?

Theorem 3.1 provides an affirmative answer when the characteristic of the field is zero. This result is interesting but not very surprising (see the comment after Corollary 3.4). The main result in Section 3 is, in fact, Theorem 3.5 which states that the binomial canonical decomposition of a binomial ideal is univocally determined by an intermediate and unique decomposition introduced in Section 2 that we have called the “canonical cellular decomposition”.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 we state without proof the theorem of existence and uniqueness of canonical decompositions (Theorem 1.2) and explore some of its consequences, especially interesting is the linear

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13F20; Secondary 13P99 .

Key words and phrases. Primary decomposition, cellular decomposition, binomial ideal, polynomial ring, index of nilpotency.

The author is partially supported by the project MTM2007-64704, National Plan I+D+I.

growth property of the canonical decompositions of powers of an ideal in a commutative Noetherian ring (Theorem 1.6). In Section 2 we proceed with the study of cellular decompositions of an ideal I in a polynomial ring S (see definitions 2.1 and 2.2). Cellular decompositions were first introduced by D. Eisenbud and B. Sturmfels in [2] as a tool for computing the associated primes and also the primary components of a binomial ideal. The advantage of using these decompositions lies in the facts that they always exist, do not depend on the field and can be computed efficiently (e.g. by adapting [6, Algorithm 2]). So, a natural question arises: is there a Ortiz-type theorem for cellular decompositions? The affirmative answer is given by Theorem 2.8, in fact, we prove that the canonical cellular decomposition is the canonical (primary) one if, and only if, every cellular canonical component is primary (Theorem 2.9). Finally in this section, we prove that, if the characteristic of the field is zero, the canonical cellular components of a binomial ideal are binomial (Theorem 2.11). In Section 3, the main results on the binomial canonical decomposition mentioned above are stated and proved. Finally, in Section 4, some relevant examples of canonical decompositions are shown.

It is worth to pointing out that the study of primary decomposition of binomial ideals has recently attracted the attention of many researchers (see, e.g. [4, 5]), motivated in part by the use of primary decomposition in the context of the so-called Algebraic Statistics. We hope that this work may stimulate the use of the primary decomposition in this and other research areas.

1. CANONICAL PRIMARY DECOMPOSITION

Throughout this section R will denote a commutative Noetherian ring.

We begin by recalling the notion index of nilpotency of an ideal of R which will be extensively used in this paper.

Definition 1.1. The index of nilpotency of I , $\text{nil}(I)$, is the smallest integer e such that

$$(\sqrt{I})^e \subseteq I.$$

Some authors call $\text{nil}(I)$ the degree of nilpotency or the exponent of I (see, e.g. [12, Section 9.2]).

The next result due to V. Ortiz [9] establishes the existence of a canonical primary decomposition of ideals in a commutative Noetherian ring.

Theorem 1.2. *Every ideal I in R admits a unique minimal primary decomposition:*

$$I = Q_1^* \cap Q_2^* \cap \dots \cap Q_t^*,$$

such that if $I = Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap \dots \cap Q_t$ is another minimal primary decomposition of I , then

- (a) $\text{nil}(Q_i^*) \leq \text{nil}(Q_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, t$;
- (b) *if $\text{nil}(Q_i^*) = \text{nil}(Q_i)$, then $Q_i^* \subseteq Q_i$.*

Proof. For a proof see [9] or [11, Theorem 6.2]. □

The primary ideals Q_i^* , $i = 1, \dots, t$, are called canonical components of I and $Q_1^* \cap Q_2^* \cap \dots \cap Q_t^*$ is called the canonical decomposition of I .

As immediate consequences we have the following:

Corollary 1.3. *If Q^* is the P -canonical component of an ideal I of R , then Q^* is equal to the P -primary component of $I + P^{\text{nil}(Q^*)}$.*

The above result was already noticed by V. Ortiz in [9].

Corollary 1.4. *Let $\cap_{i=1}^t Q_i$ be any minimal primary decomposition of an ideal I of R . The index of nilpotency of the $\sqrt{Q_j}$ -canonical component of I is the smallest integer e_j such that*

$$I = \left(I + (\sqrt{Q_j})^{e_j} \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{i \neq j} Q_i \right).$$

Proof. It suffices to note that the $\sqrt{Q_j}$ -primary component of $I + (\sqrt{Q_j})^{e_j}$ is a $\sqrt{Q_j}$ -primary component of I whose index of nilpotency is less than or equal to e_j . $\square$

Several upper bounds for the index of nilpotency of ideals in a polynomial ring are known (see e.g. the introduction of [7]). Thus, the above corollary may be considered as a naive algorithm to compute the canonical decomposition of an ideal in a polynomial ring (see [8, Algorithm 2.6]).

Let us see how this algorithm works on an example.

Example 1.5. Let $I = \langle z^2(x - y), z^3 \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$. Clearly, $I = \langle z^2 \rangle \cap \langle x - y, z^3 \rangle$ is minimal primary decomposition of I . In this case, since $\text{nil}(\langle z^2 \rangle) = 2$ and $\text{nil}(\langle x - y, z^3 \rangle) = 3$, we have that the indices of nilpotency of the corresponding canonical components are less than or equal to 2 and 3, respectively. Of course, we already know that $\langle z^2 \rangle$ is the $\langle z \rangle$ -canonical component of I (because, $\langle z \rangle$ is a minimal prime of I); on the other hand, since $\langle z^2 \rangle \subseteq I + \langle x - y, z \rangle^2$, by Corollary 1.4, we have that the index of nilpotency of the $\langle x - y, z \rangle$ -canonical component of I is 3. Thus, by Corollary 1.3, we conclude that the other canonical component is the minimal primary component of $Q = I + \langle x - y, z \rangle^3$ which, in this case, coincides with Q itself.

Observe that Q is not a binomial ideal, this can be checked by direct computation using [2, Proposition 1.1].

To show the potential of the canonical decomposition, we finish this preliminary section by using it to rephrase the following result on the linear growth of primary decompositions of power of an ideal.

Theorem. (I. Swanson, [10]). *Let I be an ideal of R . There exists an integer k such that for all $n \geq 1$ there exists a primary decomposition $I^n = Q_1 \cap \dots \cap Q_t$ such that*

$$(\sqrt{Q_j})^{kn} \subseteq Q_j,$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, t$.

Theorem 1.6. *Let R be a commutative Noetherian ring and let I be an ideal of R . There exists an integer k such that for all $n \geq 1$*

$$\text{nil}(Q^*) \leq kn$$

for every canonical component Q^ of I^n .*

The proof of Theorem 1.6 follows immediately from the results introduced in [13], for the same purpose.

Proof. By [13, Theorem 3.3], there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$I^n = (I^n + J^{kn}) \cap (I^n : J^\infty),$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and for all ideals $J \subseteq R$. So, if P is an associated prime ideal of I^n , we have that $I^n = (I^n + P^{kn}) \cap (I^n : P^\infty)$. Therefore, since the P -primary component of $I^n + P^{kn}$ is a P -primary component of I^n with index of nilpotency is less than or equal to kn , we conclude that the index of nilpotency of the P -canonical component of I^n is less than or equal to kn . $\square$

2. CANONICAL CELLULAR DECOMPOSITION

Let $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}] = \mathbb{k}[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ be the polynomial ring in n variables over an arbitrary field $\mathbb{k}$.

In what follows, given $\delta \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, we will denote by $\mathfrak{m}_\delta$ the monomial prime ideal $\langle t_j \mid j \notin \delta \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ (by convention, if $\delta = \{1, \dots, n\}$, then $\mathfrak{m}_\delta = \langle 0 \rangle$) and we will write $\mathbf{t}_\delta$ for $\prod_{j \in \delta} t_j$.

Definition 2.1. We define an ideal I of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ to be cellular if either $I = \langle 1 \rangle$ or $I \neq \langle 1 \rangle$ and, for some $\delta \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have that

1. $I = (I : \mathbf{t}_\delta^\infty)$,
2. there exists a positive integer e such that $\mathfrak{m}_\delta^e \subseteq I$;

in this case, we say that I is cellular with respect to δ or, simply, δ -cellular.

Observe that an ideal I of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ is cellular if, and only if, every variable of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ is either a nonzerodivisor or nilpotent modulo I . In particular, every primary ideal is cellular.

Definition 2.2. A cellular decomposition of an ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ is an expression of I as an intersection of cellular ideals with respect to different $\delta \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, say

$$(2.1) \quad I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta} \mathcal{C}_\delta,$$

for some subset Δ of the power set of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. If moreover we have $\mathcal{C}_\delta' \not\supseteq \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta \setminus \{\delta'\}} \mathcal{C}_\delta$ for every $\delta' \in \Delta$, the cellular decomposition (2.1) is said to be minimal; in this case, the cellular component $\mathcal{C}_\delta$ is said to be a δ -cellular component of I .

Example 2.3. Every minimal primary decomposition of a monomial ideal $I \subseteq \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ into monomial ideals is a minimal cellular decomposition of I .

Cellular decompositions of an ideal I of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ always exist. A simple algorithm for cellular decomposition of binomial ideals can be found in [6, Algorithm 2]; however, since this algorithm does not actually require a binomial input, it can be also used to compute a cellular decomposition of a (not necessarily binomial) ideal of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$. The interested reader may consult [6] or [5] for the details.

Algorithm 2 in [6] forms part of the **Binomials** package developed by T. Kahle and is publicly available at

<http://personal-homepages.mis.mpg.de/kahle/bpd/>

Now, we will show that every ideal of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ has a canonical cellular decomposition.

Lemma 2.4. *Let I be an ideal of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ and let $I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta} \mathcal{C}_\delta$ be a cellular decomposition of I . If $\delta_0 \in \Delta$ is minimal with respect to inclusion, then*

$$(I : \mathfrak{m}_{\delta_0}^\infty) = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta \setminus \{\delta_0\}} \mathcal{C}_\delta.$$

In particular, the ideal $\bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta \setminus \{\delta_0\}} \mathcal{C}_\delta$ is independent of the particular decomposition of I .

Proof. Due to the minimality of δ_0 , for each $\delta \in \Delta \setminus \{\delta_0\}$, there is, at least, a variable in $\{t_i \mid i \notin \delta_0\}$ which is a nonzerodivisor modulo $\mathcal{C}_\delta$. Therefore,

$$(C_\delta : \mathfrak{m}_{\delta_0}^\infty) = \begin{cases} C_\delta & \text{if } \delta \neq \delta_0 \\ \langle 1 \rangle & \text{if } \delta = \delta_0 \end{cases}$$

and our claim follows. $\square$

Theorem 2.5. *Let I be an ideal of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ and let $I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta} \mathcal{C}_\delta$ be a minimal cellular decomposition of I . Then the subset Δ of the power set of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ is independent of the particular decomposition of I .*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the cardinality on Δ . Of course, if $\#\Delta = 1$, I is cellular and there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, we consider any other minimal cellular decomposition of I , say $I = \bigcap_{\delta' \in \Delta'} \mathcal{C}'_{\delta'}$. Let $\delta_0 \in \Delta \cup \Delta'$ be minimal with respect to inclusion, without loss of generality, we may assume $\delta_0 \in \Delta$. By Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta \setminus \{\delta_0\}} \mathcal{C}_\delta = (I : \mathfrak{m}_{\delta_0}^\infty) = \bigcap_{\delta' \in \Delta' \setminus \{\delta_0\}} \mathcal{C}'_{\delta'}.$$

If $\delta_0 \notin \Delta'$, the right-most term in the above equalities is equal to I ; so, $I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta \setminus \{\delta_0\}} \mathcal{C}_\delta$ and therefore $\bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta \setminus \{\delta_0\}} \mathcal{C}_\delta \subseteq \mathcal{C}_{\delta_0}$ in clear contradiction with the minimality of the cellular decomposition $I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta} \mathcal{C}_\delta$. Thus, we have that $\delta_0 \in \Delta'$. Now, since $(I : \mathfrak{m}_{\delta_0}^\infty)$ does not depend on the chosen cellular decompositions, we conclude by induction hypothesis. $\square$

Notation 2.6. Let I be an ideal of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$. In what follows, we will denote by $\Delta(I)$ the subset of the power set of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ appearing in any minimal cellular decomposition of I to emphasize that $\Delta(I)$ depends only on I .

Corollary 2.7. (*Compatibility*). *Let I be an ideal of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ and set $\Delta = \Delta(I)$. If $I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta} \mathcal{C}_\delta$ and $I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta} \mathcal{C}'_\delta$ are two minimal cellular decompositions of I , then*

$$I = \left(\bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta_1} \mathcal{C}_\delta \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta_2} \mathcal{C}'_\delta \right)$$

is a minimal cellular decomposition of I , for every partition of Δ into disjoint subsets Δ_1 and Δ_2 .

Proof. We proceed by induction on the cardinality on Δ . Again if $\#\Delta = 1$, I is cellular and there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, let $\delta_0 \in \Delta$ be minimal with respect to inclusion and define $\bar{\Delta} = \Delta \setminus \{\delta_0\}$. By Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\bigcap_{\delta \in \bar{\Delta}} \mathcal{C}_\delta = (I : \mathfrak{m}_{\delta_0}^\infty) = \bigcap_{\delta \in \bar{\Delta}} \mathcal{C}'_\delta.$$

So, both

$$I = \left(\bigcap_{\delta \in \bar{\Delta}} \mathcal{C}_\delta \right) \cap \mathcal{C}'_{\delta_0} \quad \text{and} \quad I = \left(\bigcap_{\delta \in \bar{\Delta}} \mathcal{C}'_\delta \right) \cap \mathcal{C}_{\delta_0}$$

are minimal cellular decompositions of I . The result follows now by applying the induction hypothesis to $(I : \mathfrak{m}_{\delta_0}^\infty)$. $\square$

After Corollary 2.7, the proof of the following theorem is just an adaptation of the proof of Theorem 1.2 given by I. Swanson in [11], but we include it here for completeness:

Theorem 2.8. *Every ideal I in $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ admits a unique minimal cellular decomposition*

$$I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta(I)} \mathcal{C}_\delta^*$$

such that if $I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta(I)} \mathcal{C}_\delta$ is another minimal cellular decomposition, then we have

- (a) $\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta^*) \leq \text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta)$, for every $\delta \in \Delta(I)$.
- (b) If $\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta^*) = \text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta)$ for some δ , then $\mathcal{C}_\delta^* \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\delta$.

The cellular ideals $\mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ will be called the δ -cellular canonical components of I and we will refer to $\bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta} \mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ as the canonical cellular decomposition of I .

Proof. By Corollary 2.7, it suffices to prove that for each $\delta \in \Delta(I)$, there exists a cellular ideal $\mathcal{C}^*$ with respect to δ such that $\mathcal{C}^*$ appears as δ -cellular component of I some minimal cellular decomposition of I , $\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}^*)$ is smallest possible, and if $\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}^*) = \text{nil}(\mathcal{C})$ for some δ -cellular component $\mathcal{C}$ of I , then $\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}^*) \subseteq \text{nil}(\mathcal{C})$. Let S be the set of all δ -cellular components of I with smallest possible index of nilpotency, say e . Then S is closed under intersections:

$$\left(\left(\bigcap_{\mathcal{C} \in S} \mathcal{C} \right) : \mathfrak{t}_\delta^\infty \right) = \bigcap_{\mathcal{C} \in S} (\mathcal{C} : \mathfrak{t}_\delta^\infty) = \bigcap_{\mathcal{C} \in S} \mathcal{C}$$

and

$$\mathfrak{m}_\delta^e \subseteq \bigcap_{\mathcal{C} \in S} \mathcal{C},$$

then $\bigcap_{\mathcal{C} \in S} \mathcal{C}$ is cellular with respect to δ and $\text{nil}(\bigcap_{\mathcal{C} \in S} \mathcal{C}) = e$. Thus S has a minimal element under inclusion. This element, $\mathcal{C}^*$, satisfies the two conditions of the theorem. $\square$

We next derive a necessary and sufficient condition for the canonical cellular decomposition to be the canonical (primary) decomposition.

Proposition 2.9. *Let I be an ideal in $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ and let $\mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ be the δ -cellular canonical component of I . Then $\mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ is primary if, and only if, $\mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ is the $\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_\delta^*}$ -canonical component of I .*

Proof. If $\mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ is a primary ideal, clearly $\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_\delta^*}$ is prime. Furthermore, $\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_\delta^*}$ is an associated prime of I ; otherwise, $\bigcap_{\delta' \in \Delta \setminus \delta} \mathcal{C}_{\delta'}^* \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\delta^*$. So, there is a canonical component of I whose radical is $\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_\delta^*}$. Now, since every $\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_\delta^*}$ -primary ideal is cellular with respect to δ , we conclude that $\mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ is the $\sqrt{\mathcal{C}_\delta^*}$ -canonical component of I .

The converse is obviously true, because the canonical components of I are primary. $\square$

Corollary 2.10. *The canonical cellular decomposition agrees with the canonical (primary) decomposition if, and only if, every canonical cellular component is primary.*

Some examples of ideals whose canonical cellular decomposition is the canonical (primary) one are shown in Section 4.

Finally, let us see that if $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) = 0$, the cellular ideals appearing the canonical cellular decomposition of a binomial ideal of $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ are binomial.

Theorem 2.11. *Let $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) = 0$. If $\mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ is the δ -cellular canonical component of a binomial ideal $I \subset \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$, then*

$$\mathcal{C}_\delta^* = \left((I + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta^*)}) : \mathbf{t}_\delta^\infty \right).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{C}_\delta^$ is binomial.*

Proof. Let $e = \text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta^*)$ and define $\mathcal{C} = ((I + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^e) : \mathbf{t}_\delta^\infty)$. First, we observe that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\delta^* \neq \langle 1 \rangle$. Moreover, by construction, $\mathcal{C}$ is cellular with respect to δ and, by [2, Corollary 1.7(b)], is binomial.

By [7, Theorem 3.1], $\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}) \geq e$; furthermore, if the characteristic of $\mathbb{k}$ is zero, the equality holds ([7, Corollary 3.1]). Thus, in our case, $\mathcal{C}$ has the smallest index of nilpotency possible. Finally, if $\mathcal{C}'$ is another δ -cellular component of I with $\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}') = e$, then $I \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$ and $\mathfrak{m}_\delta^e \subseteq \mathcal{C}'$, and so

$$\mathcal{C} = ((I + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^e) : \mathbf{t}_\delta^\infty) \subseteq (\mathcal{C}' : \mathbf{t}_\delta^\infty) = \mathcal{C}'.$$

Therefore, by Theorem 2.8, we have that $\mathcal{C}$ is the δ -cellular canonical component of I . $\square$

Corollary 2.12. *Let $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) = 0$. If $I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta} \mathcal{C}_\delta$ is a minimal cellular decomposition of a binomial $I \subset \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$, the index of nilpotency of the δ' -cellular canonical component of I is the smallest integer $e_{\delta'}$ such that*

$$I = \left((I + \mathfrak{m}_{\delta'}^{e_{\delta'}}) : \mathbf{t}_{\delta'}^\infty \right) \cap \left(\bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta \setminus \delta'} \mathcal{C}_\delta \right).$$

Proof. It is an immediate consequence of Corollary 2.7 and Theorem 2.11. $\square$

3. BINOMIAL CANONICAL DECOMPOSITION

From now on, we will assume that $\mathbb{k}$ is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero.

Theorem 3.1. *Every binomial ideal $I \subset \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ admits a unique minimal primary decomposition into binomial ideals:*

$$I = \bigcap_{i=1}^t Q_i^{(*)}$$

such that if $I = \bigcap_{i=1}^t Q_i$ is another minimal primary decomposition of I into binomial ideals, then

- (a) $\text{nil}(Q_i^{(*)}) \leq \text{nil}(Q_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, t$;
- (b) if $\text{nil}(Q_i^{(*)}) = \text{nil}(Q_i)$, then $Q_i^{(*)} \subseteq Q_i$.

Notation 3.2. Here and subsequently, let $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta]$ denote the ring $\mathbb{k}[t_i \mid i \in \delta]$, $\delta \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ and let $(-)_P$ denote the contraction to $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ of the localization at a prime ideal $P \subseteq \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$. Moreover, for simplicity of notation and when no confusion is possible, we will write $(-) \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta]$ for the ideal in $\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ generated by $(-) \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta]$.

In the next lemma we collect, for future reference, some properties of the associated primes and binomial primary components of cellular binomial.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ be a binomial ideal. Then the following holds:*

- (a) *If P is an associated prime of I , then $P = P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta$, for some $\delta \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.*
- (b) *If Q is a binomial P -primary component of I with $P = P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta$, then $P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] \subseteq Q$.*

Proof. For a proof of (a) and (b) see [2, Corollary 2.6] and the proof of [2, Theorem 7.1'(b)], respectively. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. First, we recall that, since $\mathbb{k}$ is algebraically closed, I has a minimal primary decomposition in terms of binomial ideals by [2, Theorem 7.1].

Let Q_P be a binomial P -primary component of I with the smallest possible index of nilpotency. Set $e = \text{nil}(Q_P)$ and define

$$(3.1) \quad Q_P^{(*)} = (I + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^e)_P.$$

On the one hand,

$$P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta = \sqrt{I + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^e} \subseteq \sqrt{Q_P^{(*)}} \subseteq P.$$

Thus $\sqrt{Q_P^{(*)}} = P$ by Lemma 3.3(a) and, consequently, P is the only minimal prime of the binomial ideal $I + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^e$. Therefore $Q_P^{(*)}$ is P -primary; moreover, by [2, Corollary 6.5], we have that $Q_P^{(*)}$ is a binomial ideal.

On the other hand, by Lemma 3.3(b), $I + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^e \subseteq Q_P$. Thus, $I \subseteq Q_P^{(*)} \subseteq Q_P$ and we obtain that $Q_P^{(*)}$ is the binomial P -primary component of I .

Finally, since $P^e = (P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta)^e \subseteq P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^e \subseteq Q_P^{(*)}$, by the minimality of e , we have that $\text{nil}(Q_P^{(*)}) = e$ and we conclude that $Q_P^{(*)}$ is the binomial P -primary component of I satisfying (a) and (b). $\square$

The primary ideal $Q_P^{(*)}$ described in (3.1) will be called the binomial canonical P -primary component of I we will refer to $I = \bigcap_{P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I)} Q_P^{(*)}$ as the binomial canonical decomposition of I .

Corollary 3.4. *If $Q_P^{(*)}$ is the binomial canonical P -primary component of a binomial ideal $I \subset \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$, then*

$$Q_P^{(*)} = (I + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{\text{nil}(Q_P^{(*)})})_P.$$

Proof. This was already proved in the proof of Theorem 3.1. $\square$

Observe that we have shown that the binomial canonical components are of the form of those appearing in [2, Theorem 7.1'(b)], but with the smallest possible e for each associated prime.

The rest of the section is devoted to exploring the very close relationship between the canonical cellular and the binomial canonical decompositions. This relationship can be summarized in the following form:

Theorem 3.5. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ be a binomial ideal. The binomial canonical decomposition of I is (after removing redundant components) the intersection of the binomial canonical decompositions of its cellular canonical components.*

The key of the proof is in the following interesting lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ be a (not necessarily binomial) cellular ideal with respect to δ . If $I = \bigcap_{P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I)} Q_P$ is a minimal primary decomposition of I into binomial ideals, then*

$$\text{nil}(I) = \max \{ \text{nil}(Q_P) \mid P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I) \}.$$

Proof. Let $I = J_1 \cap \dots \cap J_r$ be some decomposition, not necessarily primary or irreducible. The homomorphism of rings $0 \rightarrow S/I \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r S/J_i$ shows that $\sqrt{I}/I \hookrightarrow \prod_{i=1}^r \sqrt{J_i}/J_i$ and therefore that $\text{nil}(I) \leq \max_i \{ \text{nil}(J_i) \}$. In particular, we have

$$\text{nil}(I) \leq \max \{ \text{nil}(Q_P) \mid P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I) \}.$$

Conversely, set $\text{nil}(I) = e$. Since Q_P is in particular a cellular binomial ideal with respect to δ , for every $P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I)$, by Lemma 3.3,

$$(\sqrt{Q_P})^e = (P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta)^e \subseteq P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^e \subseteq I + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] \subseteq Q_P,$$

for every $P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I)$, that is to say, $\text{nil}(Q_P) \leq e$, for every $P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I)$, and we are done. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.5. Let $I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta(I)} \mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ be the canonical cellular decomposition of I and, for each $\delta \in \Delta(I)$, let $\mathcal{C}_\delta^* = \bigcap_{P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/\mathcal{C}_\delta^*)} Q_{P,\delta}^{(*)}$ be the binomial canonical decomposition of $\mathcal{C}_\delta^*$. Clearly

$$(3.2) \quad I = \bigcap_{\substack{P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/\mathcal{C}_\delta^*) \\ \delta \in \Delta(I)}} Q_{P,\delta}^{(*)}$$

is a (possible nonminimal) primary decomposition of I into binomial ideals. Then, taking into account that $\text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I) \subseteq \bigcup_{\delta \in \Delta(I)} \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/\mathcal{C}_\delta^*)$ and $\text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/\mathcal{C}_\delta^*) \cap \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/\mathcal{C}_{\delta'}^*) = \emptyset$ when $\delta \neq \delta'$, a minimal primary decomposition of I into binomial ideals, say

$$(3.3) \quad I = \bigcap_{P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I)} Q_P,$$

is obtained after removing redundant components in (3.2).

Let us prove that (3.3) is the binomial canonical decomposition of I .

Let $I = \bigcap_{P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I)} Q_P^{(*)}$ be the binomial canonical decomposition of I . If $\mathcal{C}_\delta$ is the intersection of all those $Q_P^{(*)}$'s which are cellular with respect to the same $\delta \in \Delta(I)$, then

$$I = \bigcap_{\delta \in \Delta(I)} \mathcal{C}_\delta$$

is a minimal cellular decomposition of I . If $\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta) > \text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta^*)$, by Lemma 3.6, $\text{nil}(Q_P^{(*)}) > \text{nil}(Q_P)$ for some $P \in \text{Ass}(\mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]/I)$, which contradicts the minimality of $\text{nil}(Q_P^{(*)})$. Then, $\text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta) = \text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta^*)$, and so $\mathcal{C}_\delta^* \subseteq \mathcal{C}_\delta$, for every $\delta \in \Delta(I)$.

Now, if $e_P = \text{nil}(Q_P^{(*)})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} I + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{e_P} &\subseteq \mathcal{C}_\delta^* + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{e_P} \\ &\subseteq \mathcal{C}_\delta + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{e_P} \subseteq Q_P^{(*)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by applying the operation $(-)_P$, we have that

$$Q_P^{(*)} = (I + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{e_P})_P \subseteq (\mathcal{C}_\delta^* + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{e_P})_P \subseteq Q_P^{(*)},$$

that is to say, $(\mathcal{C}_\delta^* + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{e_P})_P = Q_P^{(*)}$.

Finally, since $Q_P = Q_{P,\delta}^{(*)}$ for some $\delta \in \Delta(I)$ and, by Corollary 3.4,

$$Q_{P,\delta}^{(*)} = (\mathcal{C}_\delta^* + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{\text{nil}(Q_{P,\delta}^{(*)})})_P,$$

we conclude that, $(\mathcal{C}_\delta^* + P \cap \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}_\delta] + \mathfrak{m}_\delta^{\text{nil}(Q_{P,\delta}^{(*)})})_P = Q_P^{(*)}$ by the minimality of the integer e_P , and we are done. $\square$

The proof of the following corollary follows immediately from Theorem 3.5 and Lemma 3.6.

Corollary 3.7. *Let $I \subset \mathbb{k}[\mathbf{t}]$ be a binomial ideal. For each $\delta \in \Delta(I)$, there exists binomial canonical component $Q_\delta^{(*)}$ of I with*

$$\text{nil}(Q_\delta^{(*)}) = \text{nil}(\mathcal{C}_\delta^*),$$

where $\mathcal{C}_\delta^*$ is the δ -cellular canonical component of I .

Therefore, we conclude that the indices of nilpotency of the canonical cellular components of binomial ideal can be interpreted as optimal bounds for the indices of nilpotency of its binomial canonical components.

4. EXAMPLES

Example 4.1. Let $\mathbb{k}$ be an algebraically closed field and let $I \subset \mathbb{k}[t_1, \dots, t_n]$ be a binomial ideal. If $\sqrt{I}$ is prime and does not contain any of the variables, then, by [2, Theorem 8.3], the canonical cellular decomposition of I is the canonical (primary) decomposition of I .

Example 4.2. Given a sublattice $\mathcal{L}$ of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ and a group homomorphism $\rho : \mathcal{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$, we define the ideal

$$I_+(\rho) = \{\rho(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{u}} - \rho(\mathbf{v})\mathbf{t}^{\mathbf{v}} \mid \mathbf{u} - \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{L}\}$$

in $\mathbb{C}[t_1, \dots, t_n]$.

If M is a monomial ideal in $\mathbb{C}[t_1, \dots, t_n]$, then, by (2.7) in [1], the canonical cellular decomposition of $I = I_+(\rho) + M$ is the canonical (primary) decomposition of I .

Example 4.3. In this example, we study a family of ideals from [3], where it is proved that primary decompositions of these ideals provide useful descriptions of components of certain graphs arising in problems from combinatorics, statistics, and operations research.

Let $I_{\mathcal{L}}$ be the prime ideal generated by all 2×2 -minors of

$$\begin{pmatrix} t_{11} & t_{12} & \dots & t_{1b} \\ t_{21} & t_{22} & \dots & t_{2b} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ t_{a1} & t_{a2} & \dots & t_{ab} \end{pmatrix}$$

in $\mathbb{k}[\{t_{ij}\}]$, where $a, b \geq 3$. Let $R = (t_{11}, \dots, t_{1b})$ and $C = (t_{11}, \dots, t_{a1})$. In [3], it is shown that the ideal of corner minors

$$I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} = \langle \{t_{11}t_{ij} - t_{1j}t_{i1} \mid 2 \leq i \leq a, 2 \leq j \leq b\} \rangle$$

has the following minimal primary decomposition

$$I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} = I_{\mathcal{L}} \cap R \cap C \cap Q,$$

where $Q = I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + R^2 + C^2$.

Observe that the ideals $I_{\mathcal{L}}, R$ and C are prime, so they are the corresponding canonical components of $I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}}$.

Let us prove that

$$(4.1) \quad I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} = I_{\mathcal{L}} \cap R \cap C \cap \left((I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + (R + C)^3) : \left(\prod_{i,j \neq 1} t_{ij} \right)^\infty \right)$$

is the canonical decomposition of $I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}}$.

First of all, we notice that the radical of Q is $R + C$. Moreover, $(R + C)^3 \subseteq R^2 + C^2 \subseteq Q$, so we have that $\text{nil}(Q) \leq 3$ and since $t_{12}t_{21} \in (R + C)^2$ does not lie in Q , we conclude that $\text{nil}(Q) = 3$.

We next prove that

$$(4.2) \quad I_{\mathcal{L}} \cap R \cap C \subseteq I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + (R + C)^2.$$

Let $f \in I_{\mathcal{L}} \cap R \cap C$. Since $I_{\mathcal{L}}$ is a binomial ideal not containing any monomial, by Corollary 1.5 in [2], we may assume that f is homogeneous of degree at least 2, that is, $f = m_1 - m_2$ with $\deg(m_1) = \deg(m_2) \geq 2$. On the other hand, since C is a monomial ideal and $f \in C$, the terms m_1, m_2 lie in C .

So we can write $m_1 = t_{i_1 1} m_{11}$ and $m_2 = t_{i_2 1} m_{12}$, with $\deg(m_{11}), \deg(m_{12}) \geq 1$. Arguing similarly for $f \in R$, we obtain that $m_1 = t_{1 j_1} m_{21}$ and $m_2 = t_{1 j_2} m_{22}$, with $\deg(m_{21}), \deg(m_{22}) \geq 1$. Therefore, either $m_1 = t_{11} m_{11} = t_{11} m_{21}$ or $m_1 = t_{i_1 1} t_{1 j_1} m_{31}$, with i_1 and j_1 not simultaneously equal to 1. If $m_1 = t_{11} m_{11}$, then

$$t_{11} m_{11} = t_{11} t_{kl} m_{31} = (t_{11} t_{kl} - t_{k1} t_{1l}) m_{31} + t_{k1} t_{1l} m_{31} \in I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + (R + C)^2,$$

otherwise $m_1 \in (R + C)^2$. In both cases, $m_1 \in I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + (R + C)^2$. Analogously, we can prove that $m_2 \in I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + (R + C)^2$. Therefore, we conclude that $f = m_1 - m_2 \in I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + (R + C)^2$ as desired.

Now, by (4.2), we have that $I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}}$ is strictly contained in

$$I_{\mathcal{L}} \cap R \cap C \cap (I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + (R + C)^2) = I_{\mathcal{L}} \cap R \cap C.$$

Therefore, from Corollary 1.3 and Corollary 1.4, it follows that the $(R + C)$ -canonical component of $I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}}$ is the $(R + C)$ -primary component of $(I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + (R + C)^3)$ which is nothing but

$$Q^* = \left((I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}} + (R + C)^3) : \left(\prod_{i,j \neq 1} t_{ij} \right)^\infty \right).$$

Observe that, if $\delta = \{t_{ij} \mid i = 2, \dots, a, j = 1, \dots, b\}$, Q^* is also the canonical δ -cellular of $I_{\mathcal{B}_{\text{cor}}}$ (see Corollary 2.12). In fact, we have shown that the canonical cellular decomposition of the ideal of corner minors agrees with its canonical (primary) decomposition.

REFERENCES

- [1] K. Altmann. *The chain property for the associated primes of $\mathcal{A}$ -graded ideals*. Mathematical Research Letters **7** (2000), 565–575.
- [2] D. Eisenbud, B. Sturmfels. *Binomial ideals*. Duke Math. J. **84** (1996), no. 1, 1–45.
- [3] P. Diaconis, D. Eisenbud, B. Sturmfels. *Lattice walks and primary decomposition*. Mathematical essays in honor of Gian-Carlo Rota (Cambridge, MA, 1996), 173–193.
- [4] A. Dickenstein, L.F. Matusevich, E. Miller. *Combinatorics of binomial primary decomposition*. Math. Z. **264** (2010), 745–763.
- [5] T. Kahle. *Decompositions of Binomial Ideals*. to appear in AISM Special Issue "Algebraic Methods in Computational Statistics", [ArXiv:0906.4873](https://arxiv.org/abs/0906.4873)
- [6] I. Ojeda, R. Piedra-Sánchez. *Cellular binomial ideals. Primary decomposition of binomial ideals*. J. Symbolic Comput. **30** (2000), no. 4, 383–400.
- [7] I. Ojeda, R. Piedra-Sánchez. *Index of nilpotency of binomial ideals*. J. Algebra **255** (2002), no. 1, 135–147.
- [8] I. Ojeda, R. Piedra-Sánchez. *Canonical decomposition of polynomial ideals*. <http://departamento.us.es/da/prepubli/prepub54.pdf> (unpublished preprint, 1999)
- [9] V. Ortiz. *Sur une certaine décomposition canonique d'un idéal en intersection d'idéaux primaires dans un anneau noethérien commutatif*. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris **248** (1959), 3385–3387.
- [10] I. Swanson. *Powers of ideals: primary decompositions, Artin-Rees lemma and regularity*. Math. Annalen **307** (1997), 299–313.
- [11] I. Swanson. *Primary decompositions*. Commutative algebra and combinatorics, 117–155, Ramanujan Math. Soc. Lect. Notes Ser., 4, Ramanujan Math. Soc., Mysore, 2007.
- [12] W.V. Vasconcelos. *Computational methods in commutative algebra and algebraic geometry. With chapters by David Eisenbud, Daniel R. Grayson, Jrgen Herzog and*

Michael Stillman. Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics, 2. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

- [13] Y. Yao. *Primary decomposition: compatibility, independence and linear growth.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), no. 6, 1629–1637

UNIVERSIDAD DE EXTREMADURA, DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, AVENIDA DE ELVAS, S/N. 06071-BADAJOS (SPAIN)

E-mail address: `ojedamc@unex.es`